

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES #2
PROJECT NO. F10R5200281
NetworkMaryland Fiber Path and Parole Tower Fiber Spur
July 8, 2005

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This List of Questions and Responses #2 is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above named IFB. The statements and interpretations of contract requirements, which are stated in the following questions of potential bidders, are not binding on the State, unless the State expressly amends the IFB. Nothing in the State's responses to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the vendor asking the question as to what the contract does or does not require.

1. **QUESTION:** Plan P113 shows installation of fiber optic cable in ex. Parapet/ SHA conduit from Stations 148+60 to 154+75 along Rowe Blvd. At the site visit, any existing ex. Parapet or conduit was not seen. Should this not be a new trench or bore between these stations?

ANSWER: The Parapet work and SHA conduit work is currently under construction and will be completed prior to the construction of the fiber path. The contractor will not be responsible for this construction and should bid per the design.

2. **QUESTION:** Plans P110 shows installation of fiber optic cable in ex. Parapet/SHA conduit from Stations 134+18 to 142+02 along the Weems Creek Bridge. At the site visit, there was no evidence of any existing conduits or parapets under the North end of the Weems creek bridge at Kirkley Rd.? Please clarify if the conduit in fact exists as the plans show or if the contractor is responsible for this conduit that is shown as existing from Plan P109 to Plan P113 (Stations 129+00 to 154+50)?

ANSWER: See answer to Question #1.

3. **QUESTION:** Plans P110 and P111 depict between Stations 134+18 to 142+02 one temporary 1.25" Conduit. Is this part of the scope of work, what is the purpose of this temporary Conduit and what is the sequence of construction?

ANSWER: Bidders are to disregard the note referencing the temporary conduit. This is not part of the scope and should have been removed from the construction plans. The State will be constructing only the permanent route utilizing the newly constructed Parapet/SHA conduit path on Rowe Blvd.

4. **QUESTION:** Can the contractor substitute trenching for boring such as on Plan P113 at Station 76+00 where the plans say to bore for 50' under a storm drain or is the contractor required to do exactly as the plans say?

ANSWER: The contractor must build to design as the plans indicated for P013 at Station 76+00.

5. **QUESTION:** Plan P115A shows for Item 5 a bore of 222' 1-4" HDPE but referenced to plan G7 Project Unit Summary Item 5 a directional bore 1-4" BSP 222'. Please clarify if Item 5 should be Black Steel Pipe or HDPE?

ANSWER: Item 5 should be Black Steel Pipe.

6. **QUESTION:** Plan P003 and P004 shows 366' of new 6" fiberglass conduit (FRE-BR) between Station 12+27 and 15+93, where should bidders include the cost for this on Attachment D?

ANSWER: The fiberglass conduit represented on P003, P011, and P012 has been included in the revised Attachment D included with Amendment 3 to the IFB. In addition, the conduit design drawing for the Rt. 450 bridge has also been added to the IFB through Amendment 3.

7. **QUESTION:** Plan P110 shows 784' of temporary conduit between sta 134+18 and 142+02, where should bidders include the cost for this on Attachment D?

ANSWER: Please disregard the temporary conduit identified on P110, this is no longer required to build the temporary route for this project.

8. **QUESTION:** Who is responsible for construction layout?

ANSWER: This question is not understood and cannot be answered.